



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,022	08/07/2001	Bruce E. McNair	ATT-020PUS	3026
26652	7590	05/01/2008		
AT&T CORP. ROOM 2A207 ONE AT&T WAY BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921			EXAMINER	
			BEAMER, TEMICA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/01/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,022

Applicant(s)

MCNAIR, BRUCE E.

Examiner

TEMICA M. BEAMER

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal brief filed on 9/24/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

/Charles N. Appiah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Appeal Brief, filed 9/24/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-27 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore,

the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is set forth below

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 12, 13, 18, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Freeburg, U.S. Patent No. 4,850,032.

Regarding claims 1, 18, 21 and 24, Freeburg discloses a method for determining the location of a mobile station (col. 1, lines 45-52), comprising: receiving a plurality of simulcast signals having substantially identical information from respective base stations (col. 2, line 63-col. 3, line 6; determining relative time of arrival information for the received plurality of simulcast signals (col. 5, lines 58-65); and determining the position of the mobile station (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 2).

Regarding claim 2, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 1, further including determining the relative time of arrival information using characteristics inherent in the received signal (col. 5, lines 11-35, col. 5, line 58-col. 6, line 2).

Regarding claim 3, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein the inherent characteristics of the received signal include time dispersion due to

Art Unit: 2617

simultaneous transmission of the substantially identical simulcast signals (col. 5, lines 11-35, col. 5, line 58-col. 6, line 2).

Regarding claim 7, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 1, further including receiving base station ID information in the respective simulcast signals (col. 6, lines 18-30).

Regarding claim 12, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 1, further including computing the relative time of arrival information using differential in frequency information (col. 1, lines 13-17, col. 4, lines 34-48).

Regarding claim 13, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 1, further including receiving a signal from a first one of the plurality of base stations to a second one of the plurality of base stations for identifying the simulcast signals from respective first and/or second ones of the plurality of base stations (col. 1, lines 45-52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 19, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg in view of Kostic et al (Kostic), U.S. Patent No. 6,885,630.

Regarding claims 4, 19, 22 and 25, Freeburg discloses the methods of claims 3, 18, 21 and 24 as described above. Freeburg, however, fails to disclose wherein the received simulcast signals having an OFDM modulation format.

In a similar field of endeavor, Kostic discloses combined simulcasting and dedicated services in a wireless communication system. Kostic further discloses using simulcast signals having OFDM modulation format (col. 5, lines 17-22).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Freeburg with the teachings of Kostic for the purpose of resisting delay dispersion experienced by simulcasting in cellular systems (Kostic, col. 4, lines 6-7).

6. Claims 5 and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg and Kostic in further view of Stilp et al (Stilp), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0206566.

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Freeburg and Kostic discloses the method according to claim 4 as described above. The combination, however, fails to disclose including estimating channel frequency response.

In a similar field of endeavor Stilp discloses a multiple pass location processor. Stilp further discloses estimating channel frequency response for use in a location of a mobile (0105).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Freeburg and Kostic with the teaching of Stilp for

the purpose increasing the chances of obtaining accurate TOA information for locating a mobile.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Freeburg, Kostic and Stilp discloses the method according to claim 5, further including transforming the channel frequency response to obtain the relative time of arrival information (Stilp, 0105).

7. Claims 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg in view of Watters et al (Watters), U.S. Patent No. 5,982,324.

Regarding claim 8, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 1 as described above. Freeburg, however, fails to disclose further receiving GPS signals for determining the relative time of arrival information.

In a similar field of endeavor, Watters discloses combining GPS with TOA/TDOA of cellular signals to locate mobiles (col. 20, lines 14-39).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Freeburg with the teachings of Watters for the purposes of increasing the accuracy of locating the mobile.

Regarding claim 10, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 1 as described above. Freeburg, however, fails to disclose further including computing a locus of points having a distance from first and second ones of the plurality of base stations that differs by a signal time of arrival difference for signals from the first and second ones of the plurality of base stations.

Watters discloses computing a locus of points having a distance from first and second ones of the plurality of base stations that differs by a signal time of arrival difference for signals from the first and second ones of the plurality of base stations (col. 20, lines 14-33).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Freeburg with the teachings of Watters for the purpose of more accurately locating the position of a mobile.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Freeburg and Watters discloses the method according to claim 10, further including further loci of points for further pairs of base stations (Watters, col. 20, lines 19-22).

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg in view of Baum et al (Baum), U.S. Patent No. 5,867,478.

Regarding claim 9, Freeburg discloses the method according to claim 1 as described. Freeburg, however, fails to disclose further including utilizing Doppler shift information associated with movement of the mobile station to determine the position of the mobile station.

Baum discloses including utilizing Doppler shift information associated with movement of the mobile station to determine the position of the mobile station (col. 17, lines 1-7).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Freeburg to include Doppler shift for the purpose of computing an

estimate of the desired the transmitted signal.

9. Claims 14-16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg in view of Budnik.

Regarding claims 14, 16 and 23, Freeburg discloses the limitations of claim 1 but fails to explicitly disclose what Budnik discloses which is the method according to claims 1 and 21 further including transmitting/broadcasting the mobile station position from the mobile station to one or more of the plurality of base stations (col. 5, lines 15-19).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify Freeburg with the teachings of Budnik for the purpose of allowing other entities in the system to know the location of the mobile in case of an emergency situation.

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Freeburg and Budnik discloses the method according to claim 14, further including transmitting the mobile station position from the one or more plurality of base stations to a network server associated with the one or more plurality of base stations (Budnik, col. 6, lines 13-32).

10. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg and Budnik in further view of (Oren), U.S. Patent No. 6,725,045.

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Freeburg and Budnik discloses the limitations of claim 15 as described above. The combination, however, fails to disclose

what Oren teaches wherein the method according to claim 15, further including broadcasting location-specific advertisements (col. 4, lines 8-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Freeburg and Budnik to include location base advertising for the purpose of notifying mobile units of relevant information.

11. Claims 20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg and Kostic in further view of Oren.

Regarding claims 20 and 26, the combination of Freeburg and Kostic discloses the method according to claims 18 and 24 as described above. The combination, however, fails to disclose what Oren teaches wherein the method further includes broadcasting location-specific advertisements (col. 4, lines 8-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Freeburg and Budnik to include location base advertising for the purpose of notifying mobile units of relevant information.

12. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeburg in view of Oren.

Regarding claim 27, Freeburg discloses a wireless network, comprising: a plurality of base stations for transmitting simulcast signals having substantially identical information to mobile stations to determine the location of a mobile station (col. 2, line 63-col. 3, line 6).

Freeburg, however, fails to disclose what Oren teaches wherein the method further includes receiving mobile station location information to broadcast location-specific information to mobile stations (col. 4, lines 8-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Freeburg to include location base advertising for the purpose of notifying mobile units of relevant information.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TEMICA M. BEAMER whose telephone number is (571)272-7797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (alternate Fridays) 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Temica M. Beamer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617